Application No. 09/858,403 Amendment dated January 3, 2005 Reply to Office action of 09/02/2004 Page 7 of 9

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-26 remain in the application. Support for the amendments may be found in the Specification (e.g., page 8, lines 15-26), and throughout the disclosure. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the Application is hereby requested.

Claims 1 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has cancelled these claims, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 1, 6, and 48 were objected to for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner stated that Applicant recited first event, first event code, first packet and first individual without identifying a second one. Applicant respectfully points out that the second ones of these items are recited in subsequent dependant claims. For example, "second event code," "second packet" and "second individual" are all recited in Claim 6 and "second event" is recited in Claim 26. It is believed that this objection has been overcome and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 and 7-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumpes in view of Lewin. Claims 1 and 27-65 were cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. Applicant notes that Claim 6 was held to be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. Applicant has amended Claim 6 to include all of the limitations of Claim 1, the claim from which it depends, thereby rendering this claim allowable. Applicant has amended all of the claims depending from Claim 1 to depend from amended Claim 6, thereby rendering these claims allowable.

Application No. 09/858,403 Amendment dated January 3, 2005 Reply to Office action of 09/02/2004 Page 8 of 9

Applicant also notes that it has changed the limitations added from Claim 1 to Claim 6 to read "not-automatically receipt confirmed transmission *medium*," rather than "not-automatically receipt confirmed transmission *communication*." Support and enablement for this limitation may be found in the Specification, page 8, lines 15-26. In the specification, Applicant provides several commonly-known examples of not-automatically receipt confirmed transmission media, such as pagers, wireless telephones and radio broadcasts. Applicant asserts that it would be well within the ability of one of skill in the art to employ, without undue experimentation, any one of such media in a method embodying the claim. Applicant believes that this change overcomes the grounds for rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and, therefore, it is believed that this rejection does not apply to amended Claim 1. For these reasons, Applicant believes that the rejections have been overcome relative to all remaining claims and respectfully request that all remaining claims be allowed.

## **Request for Extension of Time**

Applicant hereby requests a one-month Extension of Time to respond to the Office Action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502666 the fee for the extension (at the small entity rate).

Application No. 09/858,403 Amendment dated January 3, 2005 Reply to Office action of 09/02/2004 Page 9 of 9

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that the rejections have been overcome for the reasons recited above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that all claims be allowed.

No addition fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including any necessary extensions of time, which are hereby requested, to Deposit Account No. 502666.

Bryan W. Bockhop

Registration No. 39,613

Customer Number: 25854

Arnall Golden Gregory LLP 1201 West Peachtree Street Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-3450

Tel. 404-873-8696 Fax 404-873-8697 E-Mail: bwb@agg.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being placed in the U.S. Mail on the date written below with sufficient postage to ensure its delivery to the Commissioner for Patents at the address listed above.

Bryan W. Bockhop

Date